DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 896 HE 006 078

AUTHOR Kramer, Lawrence P.
TITLE Cooperation: The Whole is More Than the Sum of Its Parts. Planning for Higher Education; Vol. 3, No. 5:1/5.
INSTITUTION Society for Coll. and Univ. Planning, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Consortia; Coordination; Educational Needs; *Educational Planning; Enrollment Trends; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Interstate Programs; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *1202 Commissions

ABSTRACT

The long-term planning concerns of colleges and universities have been shifting in recent years. Emphasis is increasingly being placed on the exploitation of all higher education resources through regional or state coordination, and on the adjustment of services to the changing educational and vocational needs of society. The Ninth Annual Conference of The Society for College and University Planning, held in Denver July 14-17, 1974 examined the causes and results of these new developments. The report on the conference explores the implications of the new priorities in higher education. Emphasis is placed on the new realities of the 1970's and 1980's including declining enrollments, assumptions of the steady state, political implications, and finances. The emergence of statewide planning is discussed in relation to the 1202 commissions, statewide data and research, statewide coordination of academic programs, and interstate reciprocity. In reviewing the alternative of consortia, the Auraria Consortium is described, along with models of dividing up the curriculum, private participation and the future of consortia. Finally, implications for the world of higher education are discussed in relation to the students, faculty and staff, government, educational institutions, and institutional planners. (MJM)

HE 006 078 BEST COPY AVAILABLE ED098896

planning for higher education

Vol. 3, No. 5: 1/5 October 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Society for College and University Planning
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Cooperation: The Whole is More Than the Sum of Its Parts

The long-term planning concerns of colleges and universities have been shifting in recent years. Emphasis is increasingly being placed upon the exploitation of all higher education resources through regional or state coordination, and upon the adjustment of services to the changing educational and vocational needs of society. The Ninth Annual Conference of The Society for College and University Planning, held in Denver July 14-17, 1974, examined the causes and results of these new developments. Some indications of the conference's successful presentation of the issues involved can be found in the presence in Denver of representatives from statewide education agencies and university systems, legislators, and officers of consortia. These individuals, amounting to one-fifth of the nearly 500 present, comprise a new constituency at Society meetings. This report on the conference explores the implications of the new priorities in higher education.

The sharp warning, "change: adapt to new conditions or fall by the wayside," is being heard more and more frequently within the academic community. Whereas, in the early sixties the alert usually implied, "take heed of opportunities, be sure that your institution can accommodate more students, staff, and money, or you won't grow," today it warns of dangers ahead.

Even in a steady-state system, only the hypothetical average is at rest. As we approach circumstances of no-growth, a few may be winners, but most will be losers. Colleges and universities may assure a more or less stable future for themselves by abandoning their "go it alone" assumptions and creating cooperative relationships with other institutions.

Thus, the focus has shifted from the individual institution to the planning matrix: a network of cooperating institutions, defined by region, or type, sharing students, faculty, and facilities. The SCUP-9 conference, "Statewide and Inter-institutional Planning," examined the reasons for this change, and surveyed new cooperative approaches underway in the U.S. and Canada.

I. THE NEW REALITIES OF THE SEVENTIES AND EIGHTIES

Changing social, demographic and economic conditions are the source of much of the impetus toward cooperation. Lyman Glenny, director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, outlined some of these factors in an unusual way—attacking the myths perpetuated by forecasters, who contend that "we are approaching steady state," and leave it at that. Glenny asserted that the concept itself "... glosses over the realities, severely deceives the less sophisticated politician and faculty member, and thoroughly confuses the chief campus administrator." To begin with, steady-state in any real sense is at least twenty years *away*! Furthermore, the impact of a slowdown in growth both upon and within an institution is different in every case. Few will be exactly static.

Behind the Declining Enrollments

Beginning with enrollment data, Glenny noted significant regional variations in the birth rate, which will increase in long-term importance if college migration continues to decline. Present enrollment declines, at a time when the pool of college-age youth is still increasing, are due to a decline in the percentage attending. (Although the percentages of both men and women in higher education are decreasing, the figures are converging because the rate is falling faster for men.)

Glenny cast doubt upon optimistic assumptions that continuing education will take up the slack. The "drastic revisions of the assumptions of society" which would necessarily accompany a major increase in adult education are "... only a faint hope—not enough to plan for." Until the question, "who shall pay," is resolved, moreover, new types of students will not solve financial problems accompanying declining enrollments. Adult students will not pay their way until they are supported by the states as fully as full-time regular students.

Other Fallacies of Steady-State

Other imbalances are disguised by the steady-state formula, such as internal departmental reallocations, like

the 60% increase in enrollment in biology and 30% decline in physics from 1966-1972. In these situations, institutions whose planning has consisted of no more than freezing the number of tenured faculty remain unprepared.

Steady-state inaccurately describes the existing and potential situation in state aid. Funding declines began in different regions at different times; certain southern states remain on an upward trend. The effect has varied upon different types of institutions: advanced graduate and research facilities are hardest hit, while community colleges continue to receive increased appropriations. Treatment of institutions by coordinating boards and state budget officers varies greatly, with aid often bearing no relation to enrollment.

The lesson seems to be that steady-state assumptions cannot be the basis for planning in specific situations. Proportionally fewer resources may be allocated to education, yet the exceptions and those that do not exactly follow the rule predominate. The scientific meaning of the term, steady-state, is revealing. Glenny cited Fred Hoyle's definition: "continuous creation." New forms are brought into existence as other elements continue successfully and still others are winding down. Some institutions may develop loose ties with others as a means to assure their existence; some may simply not survial. Others may gradually become the raw material for consortia and mergers, resulting in new and as yet unimagined formations.

The View from the Statehouse

Oregon's Governor Tom McCall, a long-time supporter of higher education (who may become a university professor when he leaves office) examined the trends discussed by Glenny from a politician's viewpoint. The new realities of declining enrollment and limited resources are confronted and resolved at a three-way intersection: between the educator's presentations and requests, the legislator's understanding and actions, and public perceptions and expectations.

Glenny had noted that, while the public fears and negative reactions of the late sixties have largely dissipated, education has lost the nearly unquestioned esteem it had formerly enjoyed. McCall reminded his audience that popular attitudes about education are formed not only through the media, but also through the actions and speeches of local, state, and national politicians.

The Governor summarized the public conception as "wanting you to do better for less." This attitude exists in the context of what he called "higher education's long range conundrum. . . . Planners must decide whether [declining enrollment] is a flash in the pan or a long-term trend, and then decide what to do about it regardless of the conclusion." Joint efforts are one principal means of action.

McCall cited the example of the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) and the Washington/Alaska/Montana/Idaho (WAMI) medical education consortium as examples of successful efforts in cooperation to use existing resources more efficiently. Moreover, such efforts represent confirmation of the necessity that "Today's educational planning on the post-secondary level must be regional in scope, and in some cases even national."

Another major problem area raised by the Governor is also connected with regional planning and inter-institutional arrangements. Many private colleges nationwide as well as those private and public colleges which are distant from other institutions and from major population centers face an uncertain future. Said McCall, the national interest requires that these institutions cannot be allowed to fall by the wayside: too much that is distinctive and valuable would be sacrificed.

McCall reminded the convention audience that the political process goes in both directions. He asserted the absolute necessity for ". . . politicians and educators to get into better communications . . . because politicians need educators' help in making the right decisions about education." (Glenny had noted, "That we have not traditionally been candid in our relationships has led to this almost total state of disbelief on the part of politicians in relation to educational institutions.")

Education is one field where a cold-blooded evaluation of options is insufficient. (Around this fact will be developed the basic theme of the SCUP-10 conference, "Higher Education Planning: Art or Science," to be held in Minneapolis next July 8-11.) Said McCall, the understanding brought by "people with heart" is a necessary source of strength for legislators facing the hard choices that lie ahead.

Beyond Dollars and Cents

Immediate material interests were not the only impetus for cooperation cited by conference participants: qualitative concerns were equally represented. Perhaps most significant was the necessity to prevent the distortion of the existing character of institutions. This is the actual or anticipated result of institutions attempting to become "all things to all people."

Widespread specialized training, student populations increasingly diverse in age, backgrounds, and interests, educational innovations often requiring elaborate resources, have all made education a highly complex undertaking. Each particular subject, even such basics as English composition, must now be taught in many ways for different purposes and populations. Institutions must decide how to meet the varied demands placed upon them. Coordination of programs, planned to discover and fully utilize available resources, has therefore emerged as

Planning for Higher Education Vol. 3, No. 5: 1/5 October 1974. ©Society for College and University Planning, 3 Washington Square Village, Suite 1-A, New York, New York 10012. Publications Editor: Lawrence F. Kramer. Published in cooperation with Educational Facilities Laboratories, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

a major tool for the improvement of educational quality. These concerns may overshadow economic factors as motivations for cooperation.

II. THE EMERGENCE OF STATEWIDE PLANNING

Although, in our nationally and internationally-oriented world, states as distinct units are sometimes seen as obsolete, the continued existence of such anachronisms has been fortuitous for higher education. The state has become the most convenient unit of large-scale planning operations.

Statewide higher education commissions have been in existence for many years, but they have only recently assisted in coordinating the planning efforts of individual institutions. In addition, they have assumed a strategic role in negotiations between different state education networks. Over one-fourth of the small-group sessions at SCUP-9 were devoted to up-to-date reports on developments in this area.

1202 Commissions Spread

A starting point in all states has been the "1202 Commissions," provided for in the 1972 Educational Admendments Act. By May, 1974, according to a report by John D. Phillips, Associate Commissioner for Student Assistance at the US Office of Education, 48 states have received startup funds for the formation of post-secondary education commissions. The commissions have been designed to be broadly representative of all educational institutions (proprietary and non-proprietary, government, and the public). As in any experiment in popular participation, the abstract idea of representation has often come down to the reality of competing interest groups.

Statewide Data and Research

One example of an ambitious effort at statewide coordination of information on a massive level was described by Warren W. Gulko, director of budget and institutional studies at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and Bernard S. Sheehan, director of the office of institutional research at the University of Calgary. One hundred and eighteen institutions in Massachusetts have formed the Massachusetts Public and Private Forum Committee for Statewide Higher Education Reporting. They are collecting and computing direct instructional costs, correlatable to such policy variables as class section size, teaching loads, and support services. The methods enables institutions to compare operational costs with those of a variety of other colleges and universities.

A project involving both secondary and post-secondary institutions in Manitoba was described by Ben Hoffman, planning officer at the Universities Grants Commission, Winnipeg. The study is exploring motivations and factors behind student decisions in applying to and attending colleges and universities, in order to develop methods to forecast future enrollments.

Statewide Coordination of Academic Problems

The field of graduate studies might appear sufficiently specialized and well-established in its present teaching procedures. Yet a session on interinstitutional cooperation in doctoral programs, presented by Marvin Peterson, associate professor of higher education at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Michigan, illustrated the potential benefits for educational programs to be derived from statewide planning. The special attributes of post-graduate education—highly trainined individuals concentrating on carefully delimited topics of investigation—tend to prevent important crossfertilization between academics on curricula, research, and teaching methods. Interinstitutional efforts can help to avoid isolation of faculty and to coordinate research or field experiences of students and faculty.

Peterson said that we can expect in the near future to see plans for statewide cross-disciplinary and non-traditional external Ph.D. programs. Programs like these will provide ample evidence of the value of interinstitutional planning in improving and expanding educational offerings.

Interstate Reciprocity

The description provided by David Laird, director of interstitutional services program planning for the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, of the growing cooperation between the Minnesota and Wisconsin systems of public higher education provides a suitable conclusion to this survey of statewide planning presentations at SCUP-9.

The program, in operation on a continually expanding basis for the past six years, is an alternative to the autarkic tendencies of some state legislators. Faced with rising costs, elected officials are tempted to propose limiting non-residential enrollment, raising non-resident fees, and building faculties which compete with those in nearby states. Reciprocity stands these options on their heads, encouraging immigration, and cooperating on high-cost low-enrollment programs. This results in enhanced opportunities with no additional expenditures.

The Wisconsin-Minnesota program was intially limited to the immediate border area and to 600 students in nine institutions. Now, 2600 students at 39 institutions in both states are involved. The original 1:1 exchange ratio has stabilized at 2:1 toward Wisconsin; Minnesota assumes the differential costs. Reciprocal arrangements have led to cooperation in program planning, certification standards, accounting, program information, and residency guidelines. Said Laird, "Whatever procedural problems exist may be overcome through candid negotiations and a sharing of essential information. The most difficult hurdles are of a conceptual and philosophical nature."

Some problems have arisen: philosophical disagreements on funding accounting mechanisms, and on who should participate in program planning, and managerial difficulties. In this and other cases, the momentum

created by the initial successes at statewide programs becomes a powerful force in surmounting obstacles as they have arisen. Despite problems, "The experience has nevertheless been relatively successful, due to the prevailing spirit of the need to cooperate, legislative and executive support, and the growing impact on the educational careers of many students."

III. THE ALTERNATIVE OF CONSORTIA

Educational consortia, ranging from long-term joint undertakings in carefully limited areas to the virtually total integration of major institutions, are the most visible recent development in higher education. Institutions now have a new means to create or strengthen their individual identities. The mechanism is simple: examining themselves to discover their strengths, then concentrating on doing what they can do best. In meeting their responsibilities to serve a regional clientele, with needs ranging from vocational to graduate training, they can search out partners. Confident of their strengths and identities, says Harold H. Haak, chancellor of the University of Colorado at Denver, they then see "their interrelations as opportunities" rather than threats.

However, as distinguished from other cooperative efforts, which have always existed (rather unspectacularly), consortia involve some risk. Institutions relinquish sole responsibility for current operations and future decisions. The result is unpredictable. Usually, says James D. Palmer, president of Denver's Metropolitan State College, the effort is "synergistic." Cooperative action by discrete agencies results in a total larger than the mere sum of individual efforts.

The Auraria Consortium

Haak and Palmer spoke from current experience. Together with the Community College of Denver, Metro State and UC are involved in the nation's largest scale consortium. Colorado's $40 million contribution to the creation of the new Auraria Higher Education Center is the largest capital investment ever made by that state for any purpose. Parts of Auraria are already functioning; others are under construction. The complex will be fully operational by 1976.[1]

SCUP-9 was co-sponsored by the three institutions, as well as by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education and ECS. The conference was chaired by William B. Adrian, deputy director of the Colorado Commission. Thus, it was no accident that presentations on the Auraria project, as well as a visit to the site, were highlights of the conference.

Auraria's inception dates back to the mid-sixties, when informal cooperative faculty relations developed between the newly created Metro State (Denver's first public urban college) and UC'S Denver extension. Planning was begun in 1968, when the CCHE approved the Auraria site for the two institutions and the Community College (founded in 1967). Original expectations of three campus enclaves, sharing 30% of facilities, were transformed by a smaller than anticipated appropriation into plans for 100% joint facilities. A projecting size of 30,000 FTE day students, rising to 55,000, was obstructed by a limitation of 15,000 passed in 1968 by legislators angry at student activism—in retrospect, a fortuitous decision!

As described by Floyd K. Stearns, executive director of the Auraria Center, the original sharing of facilities and services (central administration for campus and grounds, security, purchasing, and shared health and physical education) set the stage for a natural evolution into program sharing (beginning with joint faculty and enrollment and a common calendar).

Frank Abbott, executive director of the Colorado Commission, said that fears of partisan behavior were not realized. The consortium began in a cautious and deliberately vague manner, similar to the thirteen states' agreement on the Articles of Confederation. A committment to involvement and the reliable agent of adversity were the sources of success. In a comment often heard about consortia, Abbott noted that if there had been fewer problems, there would not have been as much progress.

A typical example of the process of cooperation was the agreement, after much wrangling, to adopt a five-week modular basis for the academic calendar. This innovative idea represented a departure for all three institutions.

Dividing Up the Curriculum

Joint program planning has become the heart of the open-ended process of transformation and optimization under way at Auraria. As described by Richard Netzel, vice president of academic affairs at Metro State, a joint faculty-student Auraria Academic Coordination Committee began by looking at areas of low enrollment and at areas where cooperation already existed. From this, four alternative models were devised:

- **Level-differentiated model:** The roles of the institutions remain distinct. For example UCD takes responsibility for the graduate program in health, Metro State for undergraduate programs, and the Community College for nursing and other associate degree programs.
- **Integrated model:** All institutions pool resources in one area. Requirements are similar for all students regardless of institutions, resulting in joint faculty appointments and a common major.
- **Complementary model:** Faculties concentrate on distinctive areas of interest and specialty. Thus, MSC is responsible for art education and applied art, UCD for art history and fine arts.
- **Parallel model:** Similar programs remain in each institution. Convenience of scheduling is the major reason students take a course outside their own school. (Duplication may be more apparent than real: the same course may be taught with a different teaching style or faculty-student ratio.)

The organization of languages further illustrated the logic and flexibility of the model. Metro State has taken

responsibility for all esoteric languages; UC for French and German (language and literature); all three continue to teach Spanish, the most commonly demanded language.

Unexpected advantages are sometimes derived from keeping certain programs distinct. For example, a dissatisfied UCD engineering student can transfer to MSC's full engineering technology program; such programs, which are actually distinct in many ways, tend to be combined for convenience when offered by only one institution.

Costs have not as yet been a problem: discrepancies resulting from different tuition structures have been balanced by cross-registration. A uniform cost structure is not a likely immediate possibility.

Similarly, there has been little problem in the selection of joint faculty members. In the future, suggests Haak, one institution may be clearly "responsible" for a professor in terms of tenure, while more than one institution contributes to his or her salary.

Private Participation?

Provision has been made in Auraria's statutes for participation by private institutions, but, as Haak noted, constraints on individual autonomy would mean that the institution could not remain private very long. The problem of inflexible laws had been noted by Maurice B. Mitchell, chancellor of the private University of Denver, who suggested that virtually the only means of preserving the character of private institutions would be to "... fight it out: preserve our independence and our privacy; ask the state to admit us into its planning functions; consider the redesign of state laws to provide funds for the support of [private] educational institutions ... and consider the innovative ways in which consortia and inter-institutional activities might be developed."

A substantial secondary benefit of Auraria's development has been the well-planned renewal of an old section of Denver. Historic 19th century buildings have been renovated and incorporated into the campus. The Tivoli Brewery, intended to serve as a student center but vetoed by students, may be converted by a private group into a complex of restaurants, shops, and office space (in the process adding $8 million in funds to Auraria).

Auraria is a success so far. When one remembers that the three institutions are all directly connected with other campuses in their statewide college and university systems, it is clear that long-term cooperation can lead to virtually limitless opportunities for interrelationships.

The Future of Consortia

On the basis of "eight years experience of meetings on consortia," Fritz Grupe, executive director of the Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, assessed the status of the consortium movement.

Grupe noted that the isolated university has always been a myth: institutions have always been involved in casual, piecemeal arrangements. But the growing number of "formal, serious, stable, broad patterns of cooperation" is a recent development. Resulting benefits include wider student options, both in and out of class, and the sharing of faculty and administrative expertise. Quality and diversity will be the principle benefits, said Grupe, for few expect any new cost savings from consortia. Thus, he unequivocally presented one principal theme of the conference. If the issue is survival of higher education, consortia represent an answer, not in short-term financial economies, but in the long-term ability of institutions to improve their offerings and adapt to new conditions.

One major initial fear, that students at smaller institutions would "take advantage" of cross registrations, has not materialized. Particularly the stronger students at large colleges and universities, have found specific offerings to interest them at the weaker institutions.

Past errors and present difficulties facing consortia were a major feature of Grupe's presentation. Time and efforts spent on feasibility studies has often been unproductive: pilot funds might better be directed to actually beginning some forms of cooperation. It is essential to start with truly negotiable areas, often where a direct *quid pro quo* is involved, for, in cooperative efforts, no direct consequences flow from broken off or unresolved negotiations. He noted that including students in committees and negotiations has often been a useful de-stabilizing element, countervailing the usual institutional self-interest of administrators.

Some warnings about the limitations on consortia staff were also in order. Grupe asserted that consortia have no inherent ability to elicit more creative results than those produced by individual member institutions. The initial impetus for drastic modifications must remain with institutions—it would be "presumptuous" for consortia staff to initiate needed changes. Moreover, the consortia staff is usually involved in the long-term strategic evolution of overall patterns of relationships. They often have only limited contact with those day-to-day decisions made at each institution which determine the terms of future interactions.

"Getting beyond the cottage industry stage of consortium development will not be easy," was Grupe's final evaluation. The tendency now is to mindless expansion rather than to a creative, quantum jump to a higher level of productivity. Funding is only a small part of the answer. What is most needed is collective learning from each other's experiences to date. If this does not happen, we can look forward to more and more look-alike consortia, "administration by emulation," with no more than a local impact.

Grupe concluded by evoking the adventurousness of experimental activity. The paradox of administration is that planning requires good judgement, and good

judgement is acquired through good experience; but good experience can only be gained as a result of bad judgement! All the experiences and judgements must be available for others to learn from, "even when the experiences don't show up in the public relations pieces."

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE WORLD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The trend toward interinstitutional cooperation, and toward planning encompassing all institutions within a state as a totality of resources, will transform the educational environment for everyone involved.

- **For students**: The implications of the changing population mix are gradually having their impact. Social and demographic developments which are ". . . at the root of any planning meeting we can hold today," as chancellor Mitchell said, are making a reality of the long-talked about concept of "lifelong learning."[2] The average student at Auraria is typical of the expanded clientele: twenty-eight years old, married, and working part-time. Higher education now includes vocational, proprietary and junior colleges, as well as extension and community-based urban education. Students in these programs are entitled to all of the arrangements usually associated with traditional education: libraries and research facilities, transferable credits, a diversity of elective courses, student activities and services, and regular faculty. Consortia are increasingly a means of achieving greater diversity of programs and access to services in such new and specialized institutions.
- **For faculty and staff**: Here, the implications are more complex and problematic. On the one hand, traditional teaching methods and insitutional allegiances may be disrupted by new student constituencies and organizational realignments. On the other, opportunities for intellectual and experiential cross fertilization and new opportunities for unusual research and teaching experience will be multiplied.

Unforeseeable developments may result from the simultaneous large-scale emergence on the higher education scene of statewide planning and professional unionization. Charles Ping, provost of Central Michigan University, in a presentation on this topic, contended that the two dynamics must conflict. Collective bargaining, he said, emphasizes the protection of special interests, and therefore the *status quo*; statewide planning acts objectively and for the "greater good." However, other dualities seem equally likely. Recent activities of K-12 teachers unions or business-labor disputes over health and ecological issues may provide models. Statewide faculty unions may join with other major forces lobbying for funds and quality education. Yet the potential for conflict is undeniable, and the role of inter-institutional organizations is uncertain.

- **For government**: The state will remain a determining force in higher education -perhaps not so much in finding new economic assistance as in defining certain do's and don'ts for institutional relationships. (For example, new laws to rescue private colleges and universities.) Given the growing interest by legislators in establishing statewide educational commissions and planning agencies, a further shift in the initiative in education from the executive toward the legislative branch seems likely. Perhaps accompanying this shift will be greater public involvement in resolving long-term educational priorities, through "travelling hearings" by 1202 commissions and other agencies.
- **For educational institutions**: As a whole, they find themselves facing the open question of their very survival. For the first time in decades, they are truly in a life-and-death competition—both with each other and with proprietary institutions. The options may not appear to be clear, but they may ultimately be reduced to: "compete, and try to win, or cooperate, and accept whatever changes accompany this choice." And, as the experience of consortia indicates, the underlying motive of cooperation is not generally to achieve direct financial savings, but rather, to increase quality and flexibility. This is the logical import of the alternative suggested by chancellor Mitchell, "let's not build a modern institution, let's build an open framework."
- **For institutional planners**: The circumstances are perhaps most disconcerting. External conditions are no longer stable. Student preferences change faster than faculty can be trained. As described by James Farmer, of Systems Research in Los Angeles (formerly with the National Commission on the Financing of Post Secondary Education) in the closing address at SCUP-9, the tools of planning are not equal to the tasks ahead:

The issues are going to become data-oriented; we have to be very careful to put these kinds of techniques in the right context, and be very careful that the users are aware of their limitations and how they can best be used. . . . In summary, it's going to be a rough time ahead. We are asked to analyze problems that are very complex, far beyond the state of our planning art. We are going to have to do it in a very short time period, because the issues will not wait for lengthy research. . . . I would suggest that it is much more like soccer than tennis. Buy your helmet because we're going to have a rough four or five years.

Lawrence F. Kramer

Editorial note: Plans for published proceedings or for making available the texts of major speeches as well as reports on small group sessions have not yet been completed. The decision will be announced in a forthcoming issue of *News from SCUP*.

[1]See AURARIA: SUPER CAMPUS FOR DENVER, by James J. Morrisseau, *Planning for Higher Education*, Vol. 2, No. 1: 4/4, February, 1973.

[2]See LIFELONG LEARNING COMES OF AGE, by Lawrence F. Kramer, *Planning for Higher Education*, Vol. 3, No. 1: 4/5, February, 1974.

Reprints of articles from *Planning* are available from the Society for $0.50 each.